

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3 and 5-17, which are all of the pending claims, under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,317,871 (Andrews, et al.).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For the reasons set forth below, Claims 1-3 and 5-17 are not anticipated by Andrews, et al, and furthermore, these claims patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The Examiner is, thus, respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-3 and 5-17, and to allow these claims.

Generally, the rejection of the claims is traversed because Andrews, et al. does not disclose the way in which the templates and the macro cooperate together in accordance with the present invention to process the text file. Instead, with the procedure disclosed in Andrews, et al, macros are translated, but they are not called and used to map the translation.

In order to best understand this difference, it may be helpful to review briefly the present invention and Andrews, et al.

The present invention relates to a method and system for processing text files in computer application. In accordance with this invention, a plurality of templates are formed having literal fragments of the text file, and one or more macro classes are provided to map data from the text file to the computer application. Pointers to the macro classes are embedded in the templates. In operation, a template is used as an overlay to parse the text file into segments having data, or as a prototype to generate a segment of an output file. During this operation, when a pointer to a macro is reached in the template, that pointer is used to

invoke the macro class, and this macro class is used to map data from one of the segments of the text file to the computer application. The macro class then invokes another template to further process the text file.

Andrews, et al. discloses a procedure for translating source code from one high-level computer language to another. Goals of this translation procedure are to combine pieces of a source file that were generated in different translation sessions, and to ensure textual consistency of each piece of generated code in the resultant code files. In the disclosed procedure, fragment templates and partition templates are extracted from a source language text file, and a check is made for textual consistency of the target language code generated for each partition template. The described process then pieces together a target language code file from the partition templates, and combines pieces of the target language code file that were generated in different translation sessions.

One specifically disclosed translation process is referred to as the Rosetta Translator, and this process translates code from the portable Transaction Application Language (pTAL) to the C++ language. This Translator uses a syntax tree representation and a token mechanism. In particular, a source language syntax tree is used to represent the syntactic structure of a virtual source, and a source language fragment tree is employed to represent the virtual source production mechanisms that were used to create the virtual source. Tokens are placed on the leaves of the syntax tree; and each of these tokens is also used as a leaf of the fragment tree, and indicates which virtual source production mechanism brought it into the virtual source.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner specifically cited the portion of Andrews, et al. from Column 7, Line 65 to Column 9, Line 50. This portion of Andrews, et al. discussed how the partition templates are used and how the Rosetta Translator builds a pTAL fragment tree, translates the contents of a macro body, and pieces together instances of target language partition templates to form target language output files.

Applicant's Attorney has carefully reviewed Andrews, et al, particularly columns 7-9. In the process described in Andrews, et al, macros are translated, but these macros are not used to map the translation. Andrews, et al. includes several references to translating macros. For example, in Column 8, Lines 41-43, Andrews, et al. notes that "the text of macro actual parameter fragment templates is collapsed into the invoking partition just before the file is pieced together.

In Column 8, Lines 47-50 of Andrews, et al., it is explained that that the source generator "fits the text representing the body of the macro stuff into the macro definition." Further, in Column 8, Lines 57-59 of Andrews, et al., it is explained that "Inconsistently translated code can appear in any partition, not just in macro bodies." Also, in Column 9, Lines 17-19, Andrews, et al. refer to "exposing different code (which might contain macro definitions) and directives to the translator."

Nowhere in Andrews, et al. is there any reference to using the macro to map the translation.

Independent Claims 1, 6 and 10 describe how the macros are used in the instant invention. Each of these claims describes the features that a plurality of templates are formed, and that during processing of the text file by one of the templates, a pointer in that template is used to invoke the macro class. These claims also describe the features that this macro class

maps data from the text file to the computer application, and then itself is used to invoke another one of the templates to further process the text file. The way in which the first template invokes a macro, which then invokes a second template, is not shown in Andrews, et al.


This feature of the invention is of considerable utility. This nested use of templates and macros allows a processing structure to be built up that mirrors the inherent structure of the text file. Since the behavior of the macro depends both on its internal logic and the template it is passed to invoke, it is possible to reuse the same macro to do different things by passing it a different template. The net effect is that the bulk of the logic needed to describe flow of control may be included in the template structure.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and they too, whether they are considered individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest using a template/macro class combination in the manner described in Claims 1, 6 and 10.

In light of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 6 and 10 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, it cannot be said that any of these claims is anticipated by or is obvious in view of the prior art. Claims 1, 6 and 10 thus patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2, 3, 5, 14 and 17 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 1. Claims 7-9 and 15 are dependent from Claim 6 and are allowable therewith, and Claims 11-13 and 16 are dependent from Claim 10 and are allowable therewith. The Examiner is, accordingly, requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-3 and 5-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102, and to allow these claims.

Every effort has been made to place this application in condition for allowance, a notice of which is requested. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,


John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicant

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza – Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:jy

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

☐ **BLACK BORDERS**

☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**

☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**

☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**

☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**

☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**

☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**

☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**

☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.